DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 210 031 IR 009 839

TITLE Cable Library Survey Results.
INSTITUTION Public Service Satellite Consortium, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 81
NOTE 23p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cable Television; *Communications Satellites; Community Resources; *Library Cooperation; *Library Networks; *Library Role; *Library Services; Telecommunications

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes a survey of 198 libraries which had been identified as potential cable libraries which assessed: (1) to what extent a national satellite cable library network might already be in technical existence, (2) how many libraries are connected to cooperative cable companies with satellite hardware and excess receiver capacity, and (3) of that number, how many cable libraries would be interested in participating in satellite-assisted library services and video-teleconferences. Questionnaire and telephone interview responses indicated that the majority of the libraries surveyed recognized the need to expand their community service roles through some use of telecommunications. It was also found that if joining with cable systems to provide satellite program receiving locations was a method of improving community services without making demands on the library's budget, the concept was worth exploring individually on an operational basis. A list of pros and cons for a national satellite cable library network, and a discussion of potential avenues for financing close-circuit satellite events are also provided. (Author/MER)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED210031

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

CABLE LIBRARY SURVEY RESULTS

by

Public Service Satellite Consortium

IR009839

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary Diebler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PUBLIC SERVICE SATELLITE CONSORTIUM

PRINCIPAL OFFICE:

Suite 907
1660 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036 • (202) 331-1154

2480 West 26th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80211 • (303) 458-7273
TWX: (PSSCTG DVR) 910 931-2686

CABLE LIBRARY SURVEY RESULTS

Background

The Public Service Satellite Consortium (PSSC) conducted a survey of academic libraries in July, 1980 to study their data communications needs and services. Results of that study, coupled with library interest generated by that study, convinced PSSC that: 1) libraries have a wide variety of communications needs which could be addressed with appropriate uses of telecommunications; 2) all types of libraries are affected, not just academic libraries; and 3) data transfer was but one of many types of library services in need of better communications.

This information motivated PSSC to take a broader look at library communications. That second look resulted in the identification of the "cable library" (CATVLIB) phenomenon and video library services.

In December, 1980, PSSC launched a second survey directed to cable libraries; that is, libraries of all types which are connected to local cable companies. This study was aimed at determining to what extent, if any, a national satellite cable library network might be already in technical existence. How many libraries are presently connected to cooperative cable companies with satellite hardware and excess satellite receiver capacity? And, of that number, how many cable libraries would be interested in participating in satellite-assisted library services and video-teleconferences?

To answer these questions, PSSC mailed questionnaires to 101 libraries that had been identified as potential cable libraries. In order to allow the participation of unidentified cable libraries, PSSC also advertised the survey in various library periodicals, including American Libraries, Cable-Libraries, and JOLA. That ad resulted in an additional 97 cable libraries requesting to participate in the survey, raising the total number of libraries receiving the questionnaire to 198. As of April, 1981, 86 libraries have responded, yielding a 43% return. Follow-up phone calls have indicated that more surveys are forthcoming, or that the questionnaire proved to be irrelevant to present library conditions. In some cases, copies of the survey were requested and distributed for informational purposes only.

The Survey Instrument

The questionnaire incorporated explanations of terminology and was eight pages long. Additional enclosures furnished more specific information about PSSC and video-teleconferencing. The respondent was not only questioned about his/her library facilities, but also was asked to interview the cable company for necessary technical information. Though contributing to slower returns, this two-tiered approach did succeed in establishing contact between the library and the cable company, as well as provide all the data required to profile each library as a potential network participant.

Survey Participants

Since a national network is being pursued, an attempt was made to reach as many of the states as possible. Thirty-seven states received copies of the survey, while 31 had at least one responding library. All types of libraries were surveyed. Those surveyed included elementary school libraries, high school libraries, vocational school libraries, academic libraries, public libraries, regional library networks, state libraries, library systems, special libraries, and libraries which also double as their local community access center for cable television. Of the 86 who responded, 63 were public, 18 were academic, 4 were school and one was a special library.

Responding libraries have been categorized according to their ability to be an active member of the network:

UF Usable Facility - Those libraries which have met all the technical requirements for network participation. The library must be currently connected to an operational cable system which has a satellite receiving station and excess receiver capacity. In addition, the cable system and the library must have indicated an interest in participating in and hosting occasional satellite-transmitted events.

NXC No Excess RO Capacity - Libraries which meet all technical cable connectivity requirements, but whose cable system cannot presently accommodate any more activity on its satellite receiver(s), are grouped here. Should time become available in the future, these libraries are then technically able to advance to the usable facility group.

NRO No CATV RO - Here are placed those libraries who are connected to an operational cable system. However, the cable system has no satellite receiving station and therefore, no satellite access. In order to become a usable facility, these cable systems must install a satellite receiving station and be able to offer excess receiver capacity.

NCC No CATV Connection - While a cable system with all the satellite hardware requirements may be operating in the library's area, these libraries are not connected to the cable system. Reasons given in the survey are varied including logistics, economics, and disinterest. Depending upon the technical status of the cable system, a simple link may be all that is needed for the library to become a usable facility.

NCA No CATV in Area - Libraries in this group are located in areas which presently have no operational cable system. Some areas are now in the franchising process, some have awarded franchises but are not operational, and others have no idea if and when cable service will come to their areas. Libraries here have the advantage of knowing what requirements are necessary for network participation and can use this information when franchising negotiations begin.

NI No Interest - Here are grouped those libraries which are at various stages of technical capability, but have no desire to participate in a national satellite cable library network.

The following chart illustrates responses according to geographical location: (Numbers refer to the quantity of libraries from each state which fit into the above defined categories.)

STATE	TOTAL STATE RESPONDENTS	UF	NXC	NRO	NCC	NCA	NI
Alabama	0- NO RESPONSE						
Alaska	3				1	2	
Arizona	1					1	
California	5		1	1	3		
Colorado	2	2					
Connecticut	4	1		1	1		1
Florida	1	1					
Georgia	1	1					
Hawaii	1				1		
Idaho	0- NO RESPONSE						
Illinois	2	2					
Indiana	1	1					
Iowa	2	2					
Kansas	2	1					1

Chart continues on next page

STATE	TOTAL STATE RESPONDENTS	UF	NXC	NRO	NCC	NCA	NI
Kentucky	3	3					
Maryland	1			1			
Massachusetts	2	1				1	
Michigan	2				1		1
Minnesota	11	7			2	2	
Missouri	1	1					
Nevada	1	1					
New Jersey	4	1		2		1	
New York	14	5	3	3	2		1
North Carolina	2	1	1				
North Dakota	0- NO RESPONSE						
Ohio	1	1					
Oklahoma	0- NO RESPONSE						
Oregon	2				2		
Pennsylvania	2	2					
Tennessee	2	1			1		
Texas	2	1	1				
Utah	2	2					
Vermont	0- NO RESPONSE						
Virginia	4	2	1			1	
Washington	2	1					1
Wisconsin	3	3					
Wyoming	0- NO RESPONSE						
TOTAL	86	43	7	9	14	8	5

Exactly half of these respondents are usable facilities. The largest hindrance to network participation is lack of connectivity between the library and the cable system.

Library/Cable Connectivity

Part One of this survey established the degree of connectivity between libraries and their local cable companies. PSSC's major concern was to find libraries wired to at least receive cable programming. PSSC also discovered that the highest percentage of libraries had two-way connection, usually for the purpose of cablecasting. Connectivity among the 86 respondents was broken down as follows:

33 (39%)* -- two-way interconnection (transmit and receive video)
29 (34%) -- one-way CATV drop (receive only - regular subscriber)
14 (16%) -- no CATV connection
9 (10%) -- no CATV in my area or presently operational in my area
1 (1%) -- no answer to question

*All percentages have been rounded off

Other questions in this section profiled the technical capabilities of the cable system. Specific hours of each day of the week a satellite receiver was available for occasional use were charted. Weekday mornings proved to be the most available time block.

It is also imperative for PSSC to know what transponders (channels) of the satellite cable systems can access. There are 24 transponders on SATCOM I, the main satellite used by cable. When PSSC coordinates a satellite telecast, time on a satellite transponder must be secured. Each transponder is leased to someone, such as Home Box Office (HBO), Ted Turner's Cable News Network, or the Appalachian Community Service Network (ACSN), to name a few, for the carriage of their programming. Time needed by PSSC for a two-hour satellite event, for example, can be sublet from a transponder lessee, subject to availability. However, finding time slots on SATCOM I transponders is becoming increasingly difficult as many lessees are expanding the number of hours of their own programming. As a result, PSSC must know which transponders each cable system can receive so that an attempt can be made, where possible, to accommodate the majority of survey facilities.

The ideal situation is for CATVs to own "frequency agile" satellite receivers; that is, receivers which can access any of the transponders. Some receivers can get only even-numbered transponders or odd-numbered transponders; others can access only certain individual transponders. Transponder accessibility is usually related to the type of programming the cable operator offers or plans to offer to the local cable subscribers, or to the size of the system. (Older systems often use twelve channel receivers tunable to only even or odd-numbered transponders on SATCOM I.) For example, if a cable operator does not anticipate offering anything besides HBO now or in the future from SATCOM I, often he/she cannot justify the need for a frequency agile receiver. The following table outlines transponder accessibility for usable facilities only:

TRANSPONDER #	# OF FACILITIES ABLE TO ACCESS TRANSPONDER
1	2
2	2
3	1
4	1
5	1
6	4
7	3
8	3
9	6
10	3
11	0
12	2
13	1
14	3
15	0
16	3
17	1
18	1
19	0
20	2
21	3
22	4
23	0
24	5
Frequency Agile	30
Not Sure	4

NOTE: These figures are for transponder accessibility on SATCOM I. Numbers for the specific transponders were tabulated from those surveys which indicated their satellite receivers were not frequency agile, but rather could access only those transponders they had listed.

This abundance of frequency agile receivers will provide the connected libraries with a greater amount of flexibility in receiving programming since their participation will not be dependent upon a certain transponder.

Another question probed the availability of provisions for closed-circuit, discrete delivery of satellite transmissions from the cable system's receiver into the library. Being able to provide closed-circuit capabilities would ensure the privacy of a satellite telecast. Some PSSC clients insist that their transmissions be safe-guarded through closed-circuit delivery.

As expected, this closed-circuit arrangement does not exist between very many libraries and their CATVs. Unless part of an institutional cable loop, most libraries cannot presently be singled out for closed-circuit cable reception. Under normal conditions, what is transmitted from the headend of the cable system travels to everyone subscribing to the cable service. Eleven of the 43 usable facilities claimed closed-circuit capabilities are currently available. Those 32 without described what technical considerations must be present before such provisions could be offered. These technical requirements included scrambling devices, mid-band channel usage, modulators and demodulators. Such upgrading of the cable company's hardware was quoted as costing from hundreds to several thousands of dollars. No CATV indicated willingness to assume the expenses for such special capabilities, but a few did offer to investigate the possibility of temporary special links on a per occasion basis.

Library Facilities

The survey also asked about the library's facilities. Information in Part Two centered on library accommodations and equipment. Answers here provided a description of each library, which gave PSSC an idea of how adaptable to hosting satellite teleconferences each might be.

A basic satellite program viewing facility consists of the viewing area, equipped with chairs and tables, at least one television monitor (wired to receive the cable programming), and, for interactive programs, a telephone. Survey libraries reported they had conference rooms, auditoriums and classrooms available for viewing satellite telecasts. The number of viewers able to be accommodated at one time ranged from 6 to 400 with the average facility holding 75 people. Some libraries could provide simultaneous viewing in more than one room which increased the total number of people they could accommodate for a single event. A majority of the libraries had more than one monitor; some as many as fifteen monitors. Three libraries indicated they owned a large screen television projector. Forty-four percent of the usable facilities have no phones in the viewing rooms, but many explained that phones were either nearby or could be temporarily installed for an interactive event. In response to a question about the location and accessibility of the library within its community, the general comments described the majority of the libraries as being in a convenient part of town, with ample parking and barrier free design. When given enough advance notice, most libraries were willing to schedule an event at any time, even during hours and on days the library was normally closed to the public.

Traditionally, as a part of its standard networking service, PSSC rents viewing facilities for the client, whether they are public television stations, hotels, or other facilities. Libraries, as another type of viewing resource, would be entitled to receive payment for use of their facilities. Obviously, this fact treads on controversial "fee or free" waters. Being aware of this, PSSC asked the libraries whether they could accept money for these purposes; and, if not, whether they might have some other mechanism, such as a "Friends of the Library" group, to which the money could be given instead. Those libraries which said they could accept money directly for the use of their facilities numbered 34. Oddly enough, 34 libraries also said they could not accept money directly for the use of their facilities. Of that group, 31 indicated they did have a "Friends of the Library" or similar group to which money could be given for indirect channeling back into the library. Eighteen libraries did not answer this question (many due to libraries not completing the entire survey once they felt the cable information made them technically ineligible for participation). Only three libraries might have a problem with financial arrangements for an event.

Program Interests

The final section of the survey (Part Three) gave each respondent the opportunity to list topics of interest to the library and community that could be presented via a satellite video-teleconference. General comments identified continuing education, organizational conferences, training, seminars, workshops, media distribution and information dissemination as major activities suitable for satellite-assisted delivery and distribtuion. Special target audiences included the following:

1. senior citizens
2. handicapped
3. minorities
4. the disadvantaged (economically, educationally, socially)
5. the abused (drug addicts and alcoholics; abused children and spouses, teachers and students; victims of crime; and the sexually harrassed)
6. the institutionalized (in hospitals, prisons, nursing homes, mental health centers, hospices)

These special patrons are often served through outreach programs and were named here as potential beneficiaries of satellite programming. The most frequently named special population was the elderly with suggestions for retirement, social services, nursing home care, insurance and other senior-oriented programming.

Three major classes of other potential users of satellite video-teleconferencing in the library were identified:

1. Education-oriented: Pre-school and nursery students; elementary, middle, junior high, and high school students; post-secondary and graduate students; vocational, technical, extension and cooperative education students; special education students; adult and continuing education students; educational administrators, faculties, and staff

2. Government-oriented: Federal, regional, state, county and local government officials and employees

3. Employment-oriented: Professional/non-professional; salaried/hourly; union/non-union; management/staff; public/private sectors; employed/unemployed; full/part-time; permanent/temporary; big/small business; human services/trade

Particular topics of interest felt to be ideal satellite program areas within each library's community included the following: (appearing in no rank order)

energy (solar and natural resources)
consumerism
community services
environment
historic preservation/oral history
legal aid
librarianship
computers, data processing
technology
communications/telecommunications
fund raising
safety
recreation, physical education, sports, parks
language (bilingual, sign, foreign, literacy)
economics and finance (investment, banking, inflation, budgeting)
conservation
genealogy
religion
business and industry
civil defense
agriculture and forestry
health and medicine
mental health
arts and humanities
curriculum sharing
therapy and rehabilitation
real estate

Several local assocations, who have affiliates or branches located nationally, were listed as potential users of satellite video-teleconferencing: (appears in order of popularity)

1. American Association of Retired Persons
2. League of Women Voters
3. Historical Societies
4. American Library Association
5. Chamber of Commerce
6. American Association of University Women

7. Parent/Teachers Association
8. Councils of Government
9. Jaycees
10. Boy Scouts
11. Friends of the Library

Three questions concerning interest and ability to participate in future satellite video-teleconferencing activities were asked. The questions, vital to the outcome of this survey, are reiterated here with their respective answers:

1. Would you be interested in helping set up one or more of these specialized teleconferences?

Yes	--	63 (73%)
No	--	10 (12%)
Maybe	--	5 (6%)
No Answer	--	8 (9%)

2. Would you be interested in doing a local follow-up program after a national teleconference that is of interest to your community?

Yes	--	65 (76%)
No	--	6 (7%)
Maybe	--	8 (9%)
No Answer	--	7 (8%)

3. Periodically, national based organizations sponsoring teleconferences or special programs enlist promotional and site arrangement support from local site facilitators. Would you like to be listed as available to provide this support?

Yes	--	54 (63%)
No	--	18 (21%)
Maybe	--	3 (3%)
No Answer	--	11 (13%)

The interest of the libraries surveyed is well documented in questions one and two. However, their ability to presently participate is limited to financial and personnel resources as demonstrated by question three's responses.

General Conclusions and Recommendations

The majority of surveyed libraries recognize the need for libraries to expand their community service roles through some use of telecommunications. Many of the 86 libraries indicated the concept of libraries becoming satellite program viewing facilities through their cable connectivity was an idea so new to them that they could not fully understand or visualize what would be expected of the library in this novel role. Yet, the general consensus was that if joining with their cable systems to provide satellite program receiving locations was a method of improving community library services, while not making demands on the library's budget, then the concept was worth exploring individually on an operational basis.

To illustrate this concept of the CATVLIB as a satellite program viewing facility, a typical scenario would find participating CATVILIBs contacted by an organization or networking agent who wishes to reach the general community or a special segment with its satellite-transmitted programming. The CATVLIB, as the community contact, would have the option to respond negatively or positively. If the CATVLIB is interested, it must begin performing local coordination duties, most important of which is garnering the agreement of its cable system. CATVLIB and cable system discussions will determine five things:

1. Can the cable system access the satellite transponder on which the programming will be carried?

2. Will the cable system have a satellite receiver available on the date and time of the program?

3. Will the CATVLIB have its viewing facility available on the date and time of the program?

4. If desired by the program's sponsor, will the CATVLIB contact the local group who is to participate in the program and work with them prior to the satellite telecast to the extent needed by the requesting organization?

5. Can the cable system and/or the CATVLIB handle special program considerations, if any? For example,

   -- provide close circuit capability in the CATVLIB?

   -- tape the program?

   -- provide telephone(s) for interactive programs?

-- provide local site facilitation?
-- coordinate local follow-up activities?
-- provide refreshments?
-- coordinate advance publicity within the community?

Once the CATVLIB has determined whether or not it is able and desires to offer their services, the CATVLIB would be recorded as a satellite program "receive site." The CATVLIB will then assume the degree of local responsibility requested and contracted by the requesting organization, including all negotiations necessary with the cable system.

While there were survey indications of general support for such a national satellite cable library network, what are the pros and cons of its operation?

PROS

Pre-existing conditions. CATVLIBs need no investment for hardware, but merely take advantage of pre-existing cable connectivity.

Community service. Such CATVLIB participation potentially offers service to every member of the community.

Out-reach to new patrons. Those community residents not previously using the library may find this new service applicable to their needs.

Economics. CATVLIBs could recoup any charges incurred through this service, as well as expect payment as a rented receive site.

Program interaction. Live satellite programming has the advantage over taped programming of allowing the option of offering viewers the opportunity to interact with the program's presenter(s).

CONS

Lack of SATCOM I occasional time. It is becoming increasingly difficult to sublease transponder time on this satellite for occasional satellite programs.

Dependency. The CATVLIB must depend entirely on the cable system to be able to be a network participant and offer this service. CATVLIB participation is dependent upon the cable system's satellite access capabilities which generally means SATCOM I only.

Lack of CCTV. Generally, most CATVLIBs cannot offer closed circuit capability, so absolute privacy cannot be guaranteed to the program's sponsor.

CATVLIB policies. Some CATVLIBs will have to make decisions about various controversial items, such as:

-- accepting money for use of facilities
-- allowing some clients the right to limit viewing to only registrants
-- hosting controversial groups.

PROS

Resource sharing potential. This service has the future potential of providing CATVLIBs with an alternative method of accessing new information resources and data bases. Human resources can be shared now through this service.

Potential CATV expansion. More CATVs are expanding and upgrading their satellite acess capabilities as usage of satellites by cable programming vendors increases. Some CATVs have already purchased WESTAR III hardware in addition to their SATCOM I hardware.

Future implications. If satellite-related services become valued by the community, the residents might decide the CATVLIB should have its own satellite hardware so that the community could take advantage of more programming available directly from satellite.

CONS

Range of CATVLIB capabilities. Survey demonstrated that CATVLIBs cannot all offer the same degree of service due to the wide range of technical capabilities. At present, each satellite event would have to be judged individually to determine which CATVLIBS were equipped to participate.

A glance at the pros and cons of marrying libraries and satellite communications through cable connectivity suggests a national satellite CATLIB network is a presently available and usable resource with potential for future expanded capabilities and unlimited programming uses. The obstacles imposed by the cons, however, are cause for a serious and objective look at the present and future viability of such a network.

Popular present uses of satellite video-teleconferencing are for telecasting continuing education and organizational conference interactive programming to special audiences. Some PSSC clients will often request to:

-- charge his/her special audience for participating (course or conference fees, for example)

-- have the satellite-transmitted event close-circuit telecasted to the receiving locations only

-- reach specific geographical locations (often large urban areas, such as New York or Los Angeles)

Charging Special Audiences for Close Circuit Satellite Event

The first two client requests are often related. If the client intends to charge the registrant-viewer a fee, he/she often expects the program to be viewed only at designated receive sites which are hosting the paying participants. (Why should a viewer pay if he/she could watch the same program at home on a cable channel for free?) Obviously, those clients interested in a "box office" approach to their event; that is, to make a profit rather than offer a service, are not suited for CATVLIB network use. However, how can the CATVLIBs accommodate those public service groups which must recoup expenses in order to offer such satellite program services?

Client-designed incentives such as giving the phone number for viewer interaction in a program only to the CATVLIBs rather than displaying or announcing the number during the program; requiring participants to have special materials and/or integrating local pre- or post-event activities in the CATVLIBs with the program; even offering course credit to registrants only are manageable alternatives for those CATVLIBs which cannot terminate the program in their facilities only. Some CATVLIBs may be able to negotiate with their CATV for the provision of the necessary equipment to provide close-circuit capabilities. However, this survey did not identify many CATVs that were willing to cooperate with the libraries to that extent.

For those CATVLIBs whose policies restrict their involvement with financial transactions, particularly money exchange among library patrons, advance registration fees paid directly to the client could enable the libraries to avoid being required by the client to "collect at the door." Most libraries, however, by their very nature, cannot prohibit anyone from viewing a program within their facilities, thereby making it generally impossible for them to guarantee the client their requested selective audience.

Size, Location and Distribution of Receive Sites

Video-teleconference users generally want to reach as many of their members or special populations as possible, yet they must pay to rent each receive site. Economics influence their attempt to reach more people at fewer locations, not necessarily those most in need of the program. Therefore, it is no surprise that popular receive sites are located in heavily populated cities.

While cable television is finally coming to urban areas, present conditions find a lack of operational CATVs available. The typical CATVLIB now is located in a smaller city or rural area. Large states, such as California and Texas, have little or no CATVLIB representation. Only 23 states currently have a usable CATVLIB facility, which makes the network descriptor "national" not quite accurate. Expanding the CATVLIB network to include more and larger cities and all states is a must to make it competitive with other satellite networks available to a client. But, even if the network is able to expand, the previously mentioned inability of CATVLIBs to provide close-circuit capabilities will lessen its desirability as a resource when that capability is offered by another satellite ground facility in the same city.

One competitive alternative a CATVLIB can consider is rental cost. Clients expect to pay a reasonable rate for the use of each facility. This rate differs among different types of satellite networks, and even within the same network. For example, renting a public television station is generally less expensive than booking a hotel. Yet, the rate for two public television stations can vary in the hundreds of dollars. If a CATVLIB chooses to offer its facilities for free, asking only for compensation of any expenses it might incur because of the satellite event; or charges a minimal amount, their facility becomes economically attractive. One factor the CATVLIBs must not overlook when contemplating such a decision is the cable system. Will the cable system expect remuneration for its services, especially if the CATVLIB is receiving payment? Libraries must remember they have entered into a cooperative arrangement with their CATVs in order to become a satellite program viewing facility.

Toward Future Independence

While a skeletal cable library network does technically exist, it is imperative that libraries work toward their own future independence before they can truly establish themselves as a viable satellite network. Evolution of a CATVLIB network to a satellite library network might include the following two steps:

1. Expanded CATVLIB network. The survey instrument should now evolve into an interview tool for profiling additional libraries to become part of this network. Efforts should be made to encourage libraries within poorly representated states to join the network if technically feasible. Expansion is urged for two main reasons:

   - To allow libraries the opportunity to experience being a satellite program viewing facility without financial obligations.

- To allow community residents the opportunity to experience a library service with great potential for all local population segments.

Once the library is regarded as the logical place for community communications, it will be much easier to begin a community drive toward supporting the outfitting of the library with the proper hardware necessary to function in that capacity.

Requirements for becoming part of the expanded CATVLIB network include:

- At least one-way connectivity between the library and the CATV. (A typical subscription for basic service will suffice.)

- The CATV must have a satellite receiving station.

- The CATV must have excess capacity available on its satellite receiver.

- CATV must be willing to cooperate with the library in providing satellite reception of occasional satellite telecasts.

- Library must have at least one viewing room available to seat those viewing the satellite program.

- Library must have at least one television monitor, wired to receive cable programming, available in the viewing room.

- Library must be willing to assume role of community contact to extent requested by client. (Need is for library interest in participating in these occasional satellite telecasts; degree of local responsibility can be negotiated.)

Even though this network is designed to be a temporary method of allowing library participation in satellite communications, future implications could find these libraries expanding, improving, or beginning cablecasting on a library-designated cable channel. Thus, libraries deciding whether they should become involved with a temporary network, might contemplate the related activities available from library/cable system cooperation.

2. Satellite Library Network. At some point in the not too distant future, libraries will be faced with the decision of becoming independent from their cable system, and obtaining their own satellite hardware. A library with its own satellite receiving station will become more desirable to more users as a receive site for a satellite video-teleconference since it will be more flexible and autonomous. Besides satellite video-teleconferences, libraries could investigate other uses of their satellite hardware including:

   - direct satellite access (with permission recommended) for cable television fare,
   - reception of natiowide satellite distribution of taped video programming for library use,
   - facilitation of various library data communications.

   If the library is able to prove the value and practicality of having community satellite access capabilities located at its facilities to the residents through participation in the CATVLIB network, local funding of a satellite library project might be realistic. If corporations are made aware of how such a satellite library facility could benefit their own communications needs a corporate grant could prove to be another funding route. Other sources of support must also be explored.

Final Word

As a result of this survey, PSSC has profiled cable libraries of all technical capabilities for input into a data based of network resources. However, the limitations of a CATVLIB network have been noted. Effort will be made by PSSC where appropriate to use this network for client satellite telecasts. PSSC will continue to profile interested cable libraries for addition to the network, upon request of the library.

ADDENDUM

First Use of CATVLIB Network: American Red Cross Satellite Telecast

On May 21, 1981, the American Red Cross celebrated their 100th birthday by ending their annual conference in Washington, D.C. with a special two-hour nationwide satellite telecast. The PSSC coordinated distribution of the telecast which originated from Constitution Hall in Washington, D.C., from 10 a.m. to noon ET. The program was carried on SATCOM I, transponder 16 (Appalachian Community Service Network) and made available to all cable systems able to receive this transponder. Those areas not able to schedule the live program were offered a satellite-transmitted taped feed later in the day. The American Red Cross had encouraged all its local chapters to initiate program reception in their communities by approaching the local cable system about carrying the event.

Since the American Red Cross was offering a free program and trying to saturate as much of the United States as possible, use of the CATVLIB network in conjunction with this telecast was appropriate. PSSC contacted 53 libraries in 23 states who were interested in assuming local coordination for bringing this event to their communities. As the local coordinator, the CATVLIBs' minimum responsibilities included alerting the cable systems to schedule receiving this program (if the local Red Cross chapter had not already approached the CATV) and contacting the local Red Cross chapter to offer the CATVLIBs' facilities for their group viewing and concomittant local celebration.

Of these 53 CATVLIBs, only seven could not participate because of technical problems. Schedule conflicts; lack of CATV, Red Cross or community interest; and Red Cross alternative plans were the major factors in prohibiting twelve others from directly participating in hosting the satellite-transmitted program. The remaining 34 CATVLIBs did host community residents in their facilities.

Evaluation forms revealed a variety of degrees of CATVLIB participation in coordinating their first satellite event participation. Several CATVLIBs, though no one came to the library for viewing, were instrumental in getting the program into the community and available to all local cable subscribers. Advance publicity, birthday cakes and refreshments, singalongs, taping for multiple showings, and joint library/chapter pre-and post-event activities are but a few of the ways the individual CATVLIBs participated. All of the evaluation forms indicated that the CATVLIBs wanted to be contacted as a potential local site for future satellite events.

The following list names the 53 CATVLIBs who were initially contacted to be local coordinators for the Red Cross 100th birthday satellite telecast.

Though not all were successful, CATVLIB made an effort to bring the program to its community.

Colorado

Boulder Public Library, Boulder

Connecticut

Thomaston Public Library, Thomaston

Florida

Tarpon Springs Public Library, Tarpon Springs

Georgia

Tri-County Regional Library, Rome

Idaho

Pocatello Public Library, Pocatello

Illinois

Pekin Public Library, Pekin
Rockford Public Library, Rockford

Indiana

Fort Wayne Public Library, Fort Wayne
Monroe County Public Library, Bloomington

Iowa

Kirkwood Community College Telecommunications Center, Cedar Rapids
Iowa City Public Library, Iowa City

Kansas

Abilene Public Library, Abilene
Newton Public Library, Newton

Kentucky

Lexington Public Library, Lexington
Louisville Public Library, Louisville
Camden-Carroll Library, Morehead State University, Morehead

Massachusetts

Greenfield Community College Library, Greenfield
South Hadley Library System, South Hadley

Minnesota

Anoka County Library, Fridley
Cloquet Public Library, Cloquet
Crow River Regional Library, Willmar
International Falls Public Library, International Falls
Minnesota Valley Regional Library, Mankato
Marshall-Lyon County Library System, Marshall
Western Plains Library System, Montevideo
Rochester Public Library, Rochester
St. Cloud Public Library, St. Cloud

Missouri

St. Charles City County Library, St. Peters

New Jersey

Burlington County College Library, Pemberton

New York

Albany Public Library, Albany
Amherst Public Library, Williamsville
Bethelem Public Library, Delmar
Chautauqua-Cattaraugus Library System, Jamestown
Gates Public Library, Rochester
Mid-York Library System, Utica
Ridge Road Elementary School Library, Horseheads

North Carolina

Davidson County Community College Library, Lexington

Ohio

Greene County District Library, Xenia
Public Library of Columbus and Franklin County, Columbus
University of Toledo Library, Toledo

Pennsylvania

Altoona Area Public Library, Altoona
Lancaster County Library, Lancaster
Monroeville Public Library, Monroeville

Tennessee

Memphis/Shelby County Public Library & Information Center, Memphis

Utah

Merrill Library and Learning Resources Program, Utah State University, Logan
Weber County Library, Ogden

Virginia

Arlington County Department of Libraries, Arlington

Washington

Edmonds Community College Library, Lynnwood
Lynnwood Public Library, Lynnwood
Mountlake Terrace Public Library, Mountlake Terrace
Seattle Public Library, Seattle

Wisconsin

Middleton Public Library, Middleton
Nicolet College Learning Resource Center, Rhinelander